

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

AASIR AZZARMI,

Plaintiff,

-against-

DONALD NEUBAUER; JOHN DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

20-CV-9155 (KMK)

ORDER OF SERVICE

KENNETH M. KARAS, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, appearing pro se, brings this action under the Court's diversity jurisdiction. The Court has granted Plaintiff's request to proceed without prepayment of fees, that is, in forma pauperis. (Dkt. No. 4.)

**DISCUSSION**

Because Plaintiff has been granted permission to proceed IFP, he is entitled to rely on the Court and the U.S. Marshals Service to effect service. *Walker v. Schult*, 717 F.3d 119, 123 n.6 (2d Cir. 2013); *see also* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d) ("The officers of the court shall issue and serve all process . . . in [IFP] cases."); Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(3) (the court must order the Marshals Service to serve if the plaintiff is authorized to proceed IFP).

Although Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure generally requires that the summons and complaint be served within 90 days of the date the complaint is filed, Plaintiff is proceeding IFP and could not have served the summons and complaint until the Court reviewed the complaint and ordered that a summons be issued. The Court therefore extends the time to serve until 90 days after the date the summons is issued. If the complaint is not served within that time, Plaintiff should request an extension of time for service. *See Meilleur v. Strong*, 682 F.3d 56, 63 (2d Cir. 2012) (holding that it is the plaintiff's responsibility to request an extension

of time for service); *see also Murray v. Pataki*, 378 F. App'x 50, 52 (2d Cir. 2010) (“As long as the [plaintiff proceeding IFP] provides the information necessary to identify the defendant, the Marshals’ failure to effect service automatically constitutes ‘good cause’ for an extension of time within the meaning of Rule 4(m).”).

To allow Plaintiff to effect service on Defendant Donald Neubauer through the U.S. Marshals Service, the Clerk of Court is instructed to fill out a U.S. Marshals Service Process Receipt and Return form (“USM-285 form”) for Defendant Neubauer. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to issue a summons and deliver to the Marshals Service all the paperwork necessary for the Marshals Service to effect service upon Defendant Neubauer.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff must notify the Court in writing if Plaintiff’s address changes, and the Court may dismiss the action if Plaintiff fails to do so.

## **CONCLUSION**

Plaintiff has consented to electronic service of documents, but the Clerk of Court is directed to mail him an information package. The Clerk of Court is further instructed to complete the USM-285 form with the address for Defendant Neubauer and deliver to the U.S. Marshals Service all documents necessary to effect service.

The Court certifies under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *Cf. Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962) (holding that an appellant demonstrates good faith when he seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue).

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff includes “John Doe” defendants in the caption of the Complaint but fails to include sufficient information in the complaint to identify these defendants.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 18, 2021  
White Plains, New York



---

KENNETH M. KARAS  
United States District Judge

## **DEFENDANTS AND SERVICE ADDRESSES**

1. Donald Neubauer  
Jones & Jones, LLC  
5 Hanover Square #1001  
New York, NY 10004